



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,950	12/19/2001	Bernd Eilers	30014200-1014	6597

26263 7590 03/10/2005

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

BARQADLE, YASIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,950

Applicant(s)

EILERS ET AL.

Examiner

Yasin M Barqadle

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-48 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mukaiyama et al U.S Patent No. (6631407).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 1, Mukaiyama et al teach a method in a data processing system (fig. 1) having a client (clients 30 and device 10) and a server (management server 20), the method for remote processing at the client, the client having a first component of a service application (Java supporting browser application/downloaded applet) the server having a second component of the service application (fig. 7, web server part 22 uses java applet class applications and html document files), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving from the server a request to execute the first component (the server send html data s including an applet tag causing the client device to execute the device detailed screen display process col. 4, lines 10-17 and col. 9, lines 48-67);

initiating execution of the first component based on the received request (the client web browser is instructed to execute a downloaded displaying applet col. 9, lines 48-67);

after initiating execution of the first component, instructing the server to initiate execution of the second component (client requests the execution for files stored at element 25 of the server col. 9, lines 32-67 and col. 11, lines 24-38);

receiving a completion indicator from the server indicating that the second component has terminated execution (col. 9, lines 32-67 and col. 11, lines 24-38); and

terminating execution of the first component module responsive to receipt of the completion indicator (change

Art Unit: 2153

notifying packet and termination notifying message is sent col. 9, lines 32-67 and col. 11, lines 24-38. see also col. 12, lines 15-53).

As per claim 2, Mukaiyama et al teach the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

receiving a user command to execute the service application (col. 9, 32-67); and

requesting the server to send the request to execute the first component (col. 9, 32-67 and col. 10, lines 1-17).

As per claim 3, Mukaiyama et al teach the method of claim wherein the server request includes an identifier of the second component of the service application (col. 9, 32-67 and col. 10, lines 1-17).

As per claim 4, Mukaiyama et al teach the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

determining whether the first component and the second component are available for execution (col. 5, lines 31-54 and col. 9, lines 1-47).

As per claim 5, Mukaiyama et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein:

the request to execute the first component is included in a web page with a URL identifying the second component (col.3, lines 5-37 and col. 11, 56-63);

the server is instructed to initiate execution of the second component by returning the URL to the server (col. 9, lines 44-65 and col. 11, lines 29-63), and

the received completion indicator from the server is included in a response to the returned URL from the client col. 9, lines 44-67 and col. 11, lines 29-63).

As per claim 6, Mukaiyama et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the server is a web server (fig. 7, web server part 22).

As per claim 7, Mukaiyama et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the first component comprises one of a plug-in and an applet, which is executed by loading a web page in a browser application executed at the client, and wherein the second component comprises a servlet scripted at the server (col. 4, lines 10-29 and col. 11, lines 42-62).

As per claim 8, Mukaiyama et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the service application comprises at least one application selected from the group consisting of a print operation, a visualization operation, a storing operation a rendering operation, a mathematical operation, and a logical operation (fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 31-44)

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 9, 18, 27, 46 and 48, these claims have similar limitations as claim 1 and 5 combined. Therefore, they are rejected with the same rationale.

As per claim 10, 19, 28, 45, and 47, these claims have similar limitations as claim 1 above. Therefore, they are rejected with the same rationale.

As per claims 37 and 40, these claims are directed to a client data processing system with similar limitations as claim 1 above. Therefore, they are rejected with the same rationale.

Mukaiyama et al further teach a memory and a processing unit (see figs. 1 and 3 and 6).

As per claims 41 and 44, these claims are directed to a server data processing system with similar limitations as claim 1 and 9 above. Therefore, they are rejected with the same rationale.

Mukaiyama et al further teach a memory and a processing unit (see figs. 1 and 3 and 6).

As per claims 2, 11 and 20, Mukaiyama et al teach the invention, further comprising the steps of:

receiving a user command to execute the service application (col. 9, 32-67); and

requesting the server to send the request to execute the first component (col. 9, 32-67 and col. 10, lines 1-17).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 3,12 and 21, Mukaiyama et al teach the invention, wherein the server request includes an identifier of the second component of the service application (col. 9, 32-67 and col. 10, lines 1-17).

As per claims 4,13 and 22, Mukaiyama et al teach the invention, further comprising the steps of:

determining whether the first component and the second component are available for execution (col. 5, lines 31-54 and col. 9, lines 1-47).

As per claims 14 and 23, Mukaiyama et al teach the invention, wherein:

the request to execute the first component is included in a web page with a URL identifying the second component (col. 3, lines 5-37 and col. 11, 56-63);

the server is instructed to initiate execution of the second component by returning the URL to the server (col. 9, lines 44-65 and col. 11, lines 29-63), and

the received completion indicator from the server is included in a response to the returned URL from the client col. 9, lines 44-67 and col. 11, lines 29-63).

As per claims 6,15 and 24, Mukaiyama et al teach the invention, wherein the server is a web server (fig. 7, web server part 22).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 7,16 and 25, Mukaiyama et al teach the invention, wherein the first component comprises one of a plug-in and an applet, which is executed by loading a web page in a browser application executed at the client, and wherein the second component comprises a servlet scripted at the server (col. 4, lines 10-29 and col. 11, lines 42-62).

As per claims 8,17 and 26, Mukaiyama et al teach the invention, wherein the service application comprises at least one application selected from the group consisting of a print operation, a visualization operation, a storing operation a rendering operation, a mathematical operation, and a logical operation (fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 31-44).

Conclusion

The prior made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone number is 571-272-3947. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone numbers for the


Art Unit: 2153

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Yasin Barqadle

Art Unit 2153



CLINTON R. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100